J		
· .	Jay Berzofsky, et al. Application No. 09/508,552 Page 4	
	Kindly replace the paragraph at page 48, lines 3-7, with the following paragraph:	
B 7	One possible difference between CTL induced by mucosal versus systemic immunization is that the CTL resulting from the SC immunization do not have homing receptors for the GI mucosa, as evidenced by the fact that they are not detected in the lamina propria or Peyer's patches.	
	IN THE CLAIMS: Kindly replace claims 6, 27, 48 and 66 with the following substitute claims. An Appendix showing all changes to these claims is attached to this amendment as required by 37 CFR §1.121(c).	
\emptyset 8 $\frac{1}{2}$	(Amended) The method of claim 5, wherein the cytokine is contacted with a mucosal surface of the subject.	_
B9 1	27. (Amended) The method of claim 26, wherein the cytokine is contacted with a mucosal surface of the subject.	
Blog	48. (Amended) The immunogenic composition of claim 46, further comprising a base, carrier, or absorption-promoting agent adapted for intrarectal delivery.	
B 1 2	66. (Amended) The infimunogenic composition of claim 64, wherein the protein or peptide is an HIV V3 loop of T cell-binding peptide fragment thereof.	
	REMARKS	_
	Applicants have represented the amendments to the specification and claims included in the Response to Restriction filed December 5, 2001, because no indication was made in the present Office Action to indicate the amendments had been accepted.	
	This is the second restriction requirement in the present application following the vacating of the previous request for restriction. The differences between	